

Remarks

Applicants have amended the claims to expedite prosecution of the preferred embodiment. Accordingly, Applicants do not waive or abandon any of the cancelled claims or subject matter. Specifically, claims 1, 12, 16, and 24 have been amended to refer to cdx4. Claims 1 and 16 have been further amended to refer to hematopoietic differentiation. Accordingly, claims 11, 15, 26, and 29 have been cancelled to comply with the amendment. Claim 12 has been further amended to correct the typographical errors in the terms “transfecting” and “transfected.” Claims 30-34 have been cancelled as drawn to non-elected inventions. The amendments are supported by the specification as a whole and, for example, by claims 11, 15, 26 and 29. The entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Applicants now turn to the specific rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-29 as allegedly not complying with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner contended that the specification “does not reasonably provide enablement for other genes, including cdx1 and cdx2, for hematopoietic differentiation of mammalian stem cells, nor for any gene for proliferation of mammalian stem cells.”

While Applicants respectfully disagree, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims as described, *supra*. The Examiner acknowledged that the specification is “enabling for cdx4 gene or peptide for hematopoietic differentiation of a mammalian stem cell.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph has been rendered moot.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-25, 27 and 28 as allegedly not complying with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, definiteness requirement. Specifically, the Examiner contended that the abbreviation “cdx” is unclear.

While Applicants respectfully disagree, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims as described, *supra*.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-25, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph has been rendered moot.

In view of the foregoing, and there being no prior art rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

In the event that any additional fees are required, the Commissioner is hereby is authorized to charge our deposit account No. 50-0850. Any overpayments should also be deposited to said account.

Date: February 26, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No. 50828

/Leena H. Karttunen/
David S. Resnick (Reg. No. 34,235)
Leena H. Karttunen (Reg. No. 60,335)
NIXON PEABODY LLP
100 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02110-2131
Tel: (617) 345-6057/1367